

Appl. No. 10/672,655  
Amdt. dated February 2, 2007  
Reply to Office action of September 26, 2006

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Attached as an appendix to this amendment is a corrected drawing sheet showing amended FIG. 3.

**REMARKS**

This amendment responds to the office action dated September 26, 2006.

The Examiner objected to the specification, contending that it failed to clearly define a first conductive member with a support surface. At page 3 of the specification, however, the applicant stated that the “interconnection of the transmission line 28 at the chuck 20 may be one of the layers of the chuck 20 such as the top layer of the chuck 20.” FIG. 3, to which this passage applies, shows the top layer of the chuck, as well as the top surface that supports a device being tested. For clarity, the applicant has amended this passage to recite that the “interconnection of the transmission line 28 at the chuck 20 may be one of the layers of the chuck 20 such as the top layer 20A of the chuck 20 that defines the surface 20B that supports an electrical device being probed.” Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, contending that they failed to include reference numerals for the first conductive member and support surface each respectively recited in independent claim 1. Enclosed is a corrected drawing sheet that includes these reference numerals. The specification has also been amended to refer to the relevant elements in the drawings by their reference numerals. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, arguing that the function of the second conductive member was unclear, contending that the second conductive member was “just a wire or cable for transmitting the test signal to the support surface,” apparently reading the claimed “second conductive member” on element 28 shown in FIG. 3. The Examiner’s reading is incorrect. Claim 1 specifically indicates that the claimed second conductive member has “a substantially planar surface spaced apart from, and opposed to, said support surface of said chuck.” The element 28 does not meet this limitation. Instead, an exemplary “second conductive member” is shown in FIG. 3 as the suspended member 24, which has “a substantially planar surface spaced apart from, and opposed to, said support surface of said chuck.” To the extent that the Examiner is unclear where the test signal comes from, and the utility of connecting the test signal to the claimed “second conductive

Appl. No. 10/672,655  
Amdt. dated February 2, 2007  
Reply to Office action of September 26, 2006

member, the specification and drawings show that in the embodiment claimed in independent claim 1, a test signal is routed from test instrumentation, through the probe 16, the device under test 18, the top layer 20A of the chuck 20, the "second conductive member" (e.g., the suspended member 24), and back to the test instrumentation. *See* Specification at pp. 3-5 and 8. This shortened test loop reduced unwanted inductance. *See* Specification at p. 4 line 25 to p. 5 line 2. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-10.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlf  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631

Appl. No. 10/672,655  
Amdt. dated February 2, 2007  
Reply to Office action of September 26, 2006

**APPENDIX**

Attached is a corrected drawing sheet showing corrected FIG. 3